



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

p. 533). And this sentence resembles very closely the one cited by PROF. HART.

3. "Boys superior in diligence to all their school-mates, *and who* afterwards win honors at Oxford, receive great praise at Eton."* Here, working "from the inner thought outwards," I should say that, whether we prefer to write "superior" or "who are superior," the "and" is necessary: it *adds* something required by the sense, and to omit it would create ambiguity as to the antecedent of "who," which might then naturally refer to "school-mates."

I am not opposed, therefore, to *all* such locutions as "and who," "and which," etc. The sentence that I quoted from PROF. HILL is not touched by PROF. HART's remarks on the "superfluous and." On close examination of the sentence from MR. LOWELL, I am willing to concede to PROF. HART that the "and" may be omitted, for it so happens that, the "lower classes" being only another name for "our senses," these two expressions may change places, thus bringing the "which" next to its antecedent. To my mind, however, the sentence could be written more smoothly and forcibly as follows: "It is important for us to instruct and refine our senses, *which are* the lower classes of our body politic, *and which*, if left to their own instincts, will destroy the Commonwealth."

II. As to the construction "but who," "but which," PROF. HART says: "In adversative clauses, on the other hand, the sequence of thought is broken, hence there should be a corresponding break of expression." This opinion, which PROF. J. M. HART quotes from his father, I cannot accept. If it means anything, it means that the following is an incorrect sentence: "The boy who helped me yesterday, but who refused to helped me to day, is my brother." (!) It is true that such a rule would justify the following: "Other fields, perhaps not barren, but which can yield, etc."; but if this sentence be correct, it is correct in virtue of the natural ellipsis that

*DEAN ALFORD chooses to confuse such sentences as I have given under (3) with the following and similar vulgarisms: "Please send me a copy of the SHAKESPEARE Memorial, *and for which* I enclose a shilling." This, in my judgement, he has no right to do. The sentences are totally different

has been made. PROF. HILL regards "and which" and "but which" as the same solecism.

PROF. J. M. HART does not seem to accept this rule for adversative clauses, for he adds: "If there be any fault in the above, it lies in the omission of 'which are,' rather than in the use of 'but which.' The 'but' is needed to indicate contrast."

On this point I have never differed with PROF. HART. The only question is whether the 'which are' is necessary. In conclusion I hope I may plead innocent "of criticising sentences by *arbitrary* rules from without inwards," unless that be an arbitrary rule which HORACE laid down: *Usus, quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi*. To usage, reputable, national, and present, we must all bow.

JNO. R. FICKLEN.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

A FRENCH LITERARY WEEKLY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Various inquiries having reached me in regard to a suitable weekly newspaper, in French, which should represent the current literary movement in France, I think that mention of the subject may interest many readers of the MOD. LANG. NOTES. I have been a subscriber for three years to the *Annales politiques et littéraires* (15 rue Saint-Georges, Paris, 7. fr. 50) and have found it, on the whole, the most satisfactory organ for the indication of the various literary and artistic currents of Parisian life. Yet, being designed particularly for the provinces of France, many things are lacking in this publication which are evidently supplied, in the respective *départements*, by the local dailies; as, for example, a special chronicle of the literary events of the week and a necrology of leading authors and of university men. The necessity, on the part of teachers of French, of keeping in touch with the changes of French thought and expression, is so obvious, that information on this point would be very acceptable. Is there a publication which answers our needs?

F. M. WARREN.

Johns Hopkins University.